

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 1-47 and 54-58 are withdrawn from consideration, and claims 48-53 are respectfully presented for reconsideration.

Claims 48-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kindrick (USP 6,065,251). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 48 defines a child seat "wherein the curved surface of at least one of the hooks opposes the curved surface of at least two of the other hooks." The Office Action, in responding to our remarks submitted in a Reply filed September 16, 2003, states that "the examiner is of the opinion that having one hook opposing the other hooks does not solve any particular problem."

Applicants respectfully direct the examiner's attention to paragraph [0070] of the application, and to pages 11-12 of the Reply filed September 16, 2003, which explains the particular problem solved by having the curved surface of at least one hook opposing the curved surface of at least two other hooks, as required by claim 48. The child seat of claim 48 works better than those seats with hooks facing the same way.

As explained at paragraph [0070] of the application, conventional child seats do not include oppositely facing hooks. Rather, in conventional child seats that have hooks, the hooks face the same direction. When the backrest and the seat base of these conventional child seats rotate away from each other, as can occur when the child seat is lifted to move it, the hooks can slip off of the seat base, causing the backrest and the seat base to separate inadvertently. For example, when the child seat is lifted by its backrest, the seat base can rotate 90 degrees into alignment with the backrest. In this position, hooks that face the same direction can slip off the seat base. The child seat of claim 48 solves this problem. The orientation of the hooks of the child seat of claim 48 prevents the backrest from inadvertently separating from the seat base when the two are aligned, as can occur in conventional child seats.

In fact, in order to fully separate the backrest from the seat base of the child seat embodiment shown in FIGS. 1 and 9 in the application, the backrest must be rotated to a position approximately 180 degrees relative to the normal use position; FIG. 1 shows the backrest in the normal use position, and FIG. 9 shows the backrest rotated 180 degrees relative to the normal use position. The backrest does not rotate naturally to the position shown in FIG. 9 when the child seat is lifted to move it. Rather, the backrest only rotates 180 degrees relative to the normal use position when rotated with deliberateness.

For at least this reason, applicants traverse the rejection of claims 48-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

If fees are due in connection with the filing of this response and no proper payment is enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Acct. No. 19-0741. If an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 is required and has not been accounted for, such extension is hereby requested and the fee should be charged to Deposit Acct. No. 19-0741

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 16, 2003

By Mary Michelle Kile

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5349
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Mary Michelle Kile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,217